



LeJeune Residence

Report Prepared for Crowe & Dunlevy

Property Address: 327 NW 12th Ave (Norman, OK) Site

Inspection May 10, 2022 by Brett Hall



Roof Inspection Summary and Photographic Report

The LeJeune Residence (327 NW 12 Avenue, Norman, Oklahoma) was inspected on May 10, 2022 at 10:00am. The roof currently in place is a standard fiberglass composition 3-dimensional shingle (lightest weight available).

Observations:

I. Ventilation – It does not appear that the ventilation system is sufficient to properly ventilate the house. The ridge vent installation on both upper and lower ridge rows violates manufacturer design specification guidelines and can lead to the system malfunctioning and/or ineffective performance. (Refer to attached GAF document “Cobra Application Instructions” and Haag publication). Improperly vented roof systems will experience premature failure. The ridge vents were not deconstructed to verify amount of airflow they are allowing to enter. The ends were not closed in a manner to stop blowing rain from entering.

II. Scuffing – The roof shows evidence of foot scuffing which would have most likely occurred during installation and potentially additional scuffing when the home was repainted. The roofs’ granular coating has been prematurely removed rendering the shingles life expectancy less than it’s expected warrantied time period. It appears the paint contractor did not take proper care to protect the existing shingles from damages (foot scuffing, spillage, and overspray) during the repainting process (home was fully repainted above the existing composition shingle roof).

III. Exposed Nails Heads – Many areas of the roof exhibit nail heads which are exposed and/or backing out of the decking. Exposed nails can allow for water intrusion. This is not a result of direct physical damage by hail. This should be addressed as an on-going home maintenance item.

IV. Temporary Repairs – The area of temporary repair (covered by felted tarp) was not removed or examined. Destructive testing was not requested. It is unknown what or if anything lies beneath.

V. Back Slope – The back slope of the home has had previous roof repairs of an unknown age. The visible shingles used in the roof repair are a close match to existing shingles but not an exact match.

VI. Rear Valley – The rear valley was examined where a metal patch was installed. There is a base layer of valley metal (sheet metal) over the decking and under the shingles (effectively serving as two layers of protection). There is a metal ‘slip’ shingle in the valley trough for no known reason. There is evidence of wet decking at the eave of this valley (timeline/age unknown). The most likely explanation of that stain to the decking would be backed up water in the gutter. There was no evidence of direct physical damage due to wind or hail.

VII. Vents/Penetrations – Rubber plumbing vents are deteriorated by sun/age and should be exchanged. This is not due to wind or hail. HVAC vents are not sealed and can allow for water penetration. Vent collars should be sealed with a quality sealant.

VIII. Improper Installation Techniques – Examples of improper installation are seen throughout the roof. There is no metal edge (2x2 metal edge is required per code) at the eave. Additionally, the installation offset of the shingles is incorrect/inconsistent throughout the field of the roof which can lead to shingle blow-offs as well as affect a roof’s water shedding abilities. The distance in which a product is horizontally spaced during installation is called “offset”. The manufacturers call for varying patterns of offset but the key is that it is consistent throughout the shingle application. The offset in the images depicted in this report is inconsistent and renders the product improperly installed according to all manufacturers’ specifications as well as recommendations from the A.R.M.A. (Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association) manual (copy included with report). This can invalidate the manufacturer’s warranty on the shingle.

IX. Attic Inspection – The attic and a bucket in the attic were examined and no evidence of a roof leak was found.

Conclusion:

A thorough inspection of the property and photographic documentation was conducted using skills and techniques I have developed in over 30 years in the roofing and construction industry. It is my

opinion that despite the roof having a myriad of problems associated with improper installation, the shingles do not have evidence of direct physical damage from wind or hail.

The observations in this report are based upon my on-site inspection. Additionally, I was provided documents, estimates and photos pertinent to this matter. I reserve the right to modify, amend, or expand my report should additional and/or new information be presented.